

EXHIBIT B

PART 2

- ***In re Prison Realty Sec. Litig.***, Case No. 3:99-0452 (M.D. Tenn.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as lead counsel for the class, obtaining a \$105 million recovery.

- ***In re Honeywell Int'l, Inc. Sec. Litig.***, Case No. 00-cv-03605 (DRD) (D. N.J.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as lead counsel for a class of investors that purchased Honeywell's common stock. The case charged defendants Honeywell and its top officers with violations of the federal securities laws, alleging defendants made false public statements concerning Honeywell's merger with Allied Signal, Inc., and also alleging that defendants falsified Honeywell's financial statements. After extensive discovery, Lerach Coughlin attorneys obtained a \$100 million settlement for the class.

- ***In re AT&T Corp. Sec. Litig.***, MDL No. 1399 (N.J.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as lead counsel for a class of investors that purchased AT&T common stock. The case charged defendants AT&T Corporation and its former Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, C. Michael Armstrong, with violations of the federal securities laws in connection with AT&T's April 2000 initial public offering of its wireless tracking stock, the largest IPO in American history. After two weeks of trial, and on the eve of scheduled testimony by Armstrong and infamous telecom analyst Jack Grubman, defendants agreed to settle the case for \$100 million. In granting approval of the settlement, the Court stated the following about Lerach Coughlin:

Lead Counsel are highly skilled attorneys with great experience in prosecuting complex securities action[s], and their professionalism and diligence displayed during litigation substantiates this characterization. The Court notes that Lead Counsel displayed excellent lawyering skills through their consistent preparedness during court proceedings, arguments and the trial, and their well-written and thoroughly researched submissions to the Court. Undoubtedly, the attentive and persistent effort of Lead Counsel was integral in achieving the excellent result for the Class.

- ***City of San Jose v. PaineWebber***, Case No. C-84-20601(RFP) (N.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys filed a lawsuit on behalf of the City of San Jose to recover speculative trading losses from its former auditors and 13 brokerage firms. In June 1990, following a six-month trial, the jury returned a verdict for the City, awarding over \$18 million in damages plus pre-judgment interest. The City also recovered an additional \$12 million in settlements prior to and during the trial.

- ***Hicks v. Nationwide***, Case No. 602469 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Diego County). Lerach Coughlin attorneys represented a class of consumers alleging fraud involving military purchasers of life insurance, in which a jury trial resulted in a full recovery for the class, plus punitive damages.

- ***In re Nat'l Health Labs. Sec. Litig.***, Case No. CV-92-1949-RBB (S.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel and obtained a pretrial recovery of \$64 million in this securities fraud class action.

- ***In re Informix Corp. Sec. Litig.***, Case No. C-97-1289-CRB (N.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel for the class and obtained a recovery of \$137.5 million.

- ***In re Apple Computer Sec. Litig.***, Case No. C-84-20148(A)-JW (N.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as lead counsel and after several years of litigation obtained a \$100 million jury verdict in this securities fraud class action. The verdict was later upset on post-trial motions, but the case was settled favorably to the class.

- ***In re Nat'l Med. Enters. Sec. Litig.***, Case No. CV-91-5452-TJH (C.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel and recovered \$60.75 million in this securities fraud class action.
- ***In re Nucorp Energy Sec. Litig.***, MDL No. 514 (S.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel in this consolidated class action and recovered \$55 million.
- ***In re U.S. Fin. Sec. Litig.***, MDL No. 161 (S.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys acted as chairman of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee and achieved a pretrial recovery of over \$50 million.
- ***Barr v. United Methodist Church***, Case No. 404611 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Diego County). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as lead and trial counsel in this class action on behalf of elderly persons who lost their life savings when a church-sponsored retirement home that had sold them prepaid life-care contracts went bankrupt. After four years of intensive litigation – three trips to the U.S. Supreme Court and five months of trial – plaintiffs obtained a settlement providing over \$40 million in benefits to the class members. In approving that settlement, Judge James Foucht praised the result as “a most extraordinary accomplishment” and noted that it was the “product of the skill, effort and determination of plaintiffs’ counsel.”
- ***Grobow v. Dingman*** (The Henley Group Litigation), Case No. 575076 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Diego County). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel and obtained \$42 million derivatively on behalf of The Henley Group, Inc.
- ***In re Itel Sec. Litig.***, Case No. C-79-2168A-RPA (N.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel in this securities class action that recovered \$40 million.
- ***In re Fin. Corp. of Am.***, Case No. CV-84-6050-TJH(Bx) (C.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel and obtained a recovery of \$41 million.
- ***In re Oak Indus. Sec. Litig.***, Case No. 83-0537-G(M) (S.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel in this case and obtained a recovery of \$33 million.
- ***In re Wickes Cos. Sec. Litig.***, MDL No. 513 (S.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as liaison counsel in this consolidated securities law class action that recovered \$32 million.
- ***Weinberger v. Shumway*** (The Signal Companies, Inc.), Case No. 547586 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Diego County). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel in this derivative litigation challenging executive “golden parachute” contracts, and obtained a recovery of approximately \$23 million.
- ***In re Seafirst Sec. Litig.***, Case No. C-83-771-R (W.D. Wash.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel in this class action and obtained a pretrial recovery of \$13.6 million.
- ***In re Waste Mgmt. Sec. Litig.***, Case No. 83-C2167 (N.D. Ill.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel in this case and obtained a pretrial recovery of \$11.5 million.
- ***In re IDB Commc'ns Group, Inc. Sec. Litig.***, Case No. CV-94-3618 (C.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel in this case and obtained a pretrial recovery of \$75 million.

- ***In re Boeing Sec. Litig.***, Case No. C97-1715Z (W.D. Wash.). A securities class action in which Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel for the class obtaining a recovery in the amount of \$92.5 million.

- ***Thurber v. Mattel, Inc., et al.***, Case No. CV-99-10368-MRP (C.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as Chair of the Executive Committee of Plaintiffs' Counsel and obtained a recovery of \$122 million.

- ***In re Dollar Gen. Sec. Litig.***, Case No. 3:01-0388 (M.D. Tenn.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel and obtained a recovery of \$172.5 million.

- ***Pirelli Armstrong Tire Corp. Retiree Med. Benefits Trust v. Hanover Compressor Co.***, Case No. H-02-0410 (S.D. Tex.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as lead counsel and obtained a recovery of \$85 million.

- ***In re Reliance Acceptance Group, Inc. Sec. Litig.***, MDL No. 1304 (D. Del.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as co-lead counsel and obtained a recovery of \$39 million.

- ***Schwartz v. Visa Int'l, et al.***, Case No. 822404-4 (Cal. Super. Ct., Alameda County). After years of litigation and a six month trial, Lerach Coughlin attorneys won one of the largest consumer protection verdicts ever awarded in the United States. Lerach Coughlin attorneys represented California consumers who sued Visa and MasterCard for intentionally imposing and concealing a fee from their cardholders. The Court ordered Visa and MasterCard to return \$800,000,000 in cardholder losses, which represented 100% of the amount illegally taken, plus 2% interest. In addition, the Court ordered full disclosure of the hidden fee.

- ***Morris v. Lifescan, Inc.***, Case No. CV-98-20321-JF (N.D. Cal.). Lerach Coughlin attorneys were responsible for achieving a \$45 million all-cash settlement with Johnson & Johnson and its wholly-owned subsidiary, Lifescan, Inc., over claims that Lifescan deceptively marketed and sold a defective blood glucose monitoring system for diabetics. The Lifescan settlement was noted by the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California as providing "exceptional results" for members of the class.

- ***Thompson v. Metro. Life Ins. Co.***, 216 F.R.D. 55 (S.D.N.Y. 2003). Lerach Coughlin attorneys served as lead counsel and obtained \$145 million for the class in a settlement involving racial discrimination claims in the sale of life insurance.

- ***In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am. Sales Practices Litig.***, 962 F. Supp. 450 (D. N.J. 1997). In one of the first cases of its kind, Lerach Coughlin attorneys obtained a settlement of over \$1.2 billion for deceptive sales practices in connection with the sale of life insurance involving the "vanishing premium" sales scheme.

- ***Brody v. Hellman***, Case No. 00-CV-4142 (D. Colo.). Lerach Coughlin was Court-appointed counsel for a class of former stockholders of US West, Inc. who sought to recover a dividend declared by US West before its merger with Qwest. The merger closed before the record and payment dates for the dividend, which Qwest did not pay following the merger. The case was hard fought, and the plaintiffs survived a motion to dismiss, two motions for summary judgment and successfully certified the class over vigorous opposition from defendants. In certifying the class, the Court commented,

"Defendants do not contest that Plaintiffs' attorneys are extremely well qualified to represent the putative class. This litigation has been ongoing for four years; in that time Plaintiffs' counsel has proven that they are more than adequate in ability, determination, and resources to represent the putative class." The case settled for \$50 million, an outstanding settlement for the class given the novel and difficult legal questions raised in the case.

Precedent-Setting Decisions

Investor and Shareholder Rights

- ***Dura Pharm., Inc. v. Broudo***, __ U.S. __, 125 S. Ct. 1627; 161 L. Ed. 2d 577 (2005). Resolving a conflict among the circuits on pleading and proving loss causation, the Supreme Court adopted a rule that investors may proceed by pleading and proving that securities they purchased declined in value because of the fraud alleged – as, for example, by alleging that the securities' market price fell when news of the issuer's true financial state began to leak out.
- ***In re Daou Systems Inc. Sec. Litig.***, 411 F.3d 1006 (9th Cir. 2005). The Ninth Circuit sustained investors' allegations of accounting fraud and ruled that loss causation was adequately alleged by pleading that the value of the stock they purchased declined when the issuer's true financial condition was revealed.
- ***Barrie v. Intervice-Brite, Inc.***, 409 F.3d 653 (5th Cir. 2005). The Fifth Circuit held that where corporate officers made public statements together, an investor's allegations of the false statements meets the heightened pleading requirements for federal securities claims, and that the corporate officer who stood by silently while false statements were made – failing to correct them – may be liable along with the officer who actually made them.
- ***Newby v. Enron Corp.***, 394 F.3d 296 (5th Cir. 2004). The Fifth Circuit upheld a partial settlement in a complex case that was structured to support further litigation of that case in order to maximize recovery against the remaining defendants.
- ***Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund v. Citigroup, Inc.***, 391 F.3d 844 (7th Cir. 2004). The Seventh Circuit upheld a district court's decision that the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund was entitled to litigate its claims under the federal Securities Act of 1933 against WorldCom's underwriters before a state court rather than before the federal forum sought by the defendants.
- ***City of Monroe Employees Retirement System v. Bridgestone Corp.***, 387 F.3d 468 (6th Cir. 2005). The Sixth Circuit held that a statement regarding objective data supposedly supporting a corporation's belief that its tires were safe was actionable, where jurors could have found a reasonable basis to believe the corporation was aware of undisclosed facts seriously undermining the statement's accuracy.
- ***Nursing Home Pension Fund, Local 144 v. Oracle Corp.***, 380 F.3d 1226 (9th Cir. 2004). The Ninth Circuit ruled that defendants' fraudulent intent could be inferred from allegations concerning their false representations, insider stock sales and improper accounting methods.

- ***Southland Sec. Corp. v. INSpire Ins. Solutions Inc.***, 365 F.3d 353 (5th Cir. 2004). The Fifth Circuit sustained allegations that an issuer's CEO made fraudulent statements in connection with a contract announcement.
- ***No. 84 Employer-Teamster Joint Council Pension Trust Fund v. Am. W. Holding Corp.***, 320 F.3d 920 (9th Cir. 2003). *America West* is a landmark Ninth Circuit decision holding that investors pleaded with particularity facts raising a strong inference of corporate defendants' fraudulent intent under heightened pleading standards of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995.
- ***Pirraglia v. Novell, Inc.***, 339 F.3d 1182 (10th Cir. 2003). In *Pirraglia*, the Tenth Circuit upheld investors' accounting-fraud claims, concluding that their complaint presented with particularity facts raising a strong inference of the defendants' fraudulent intent, and that absence of insider trading by individual defendants did not mean they lacked a motive to commit fraud.
- ***In re Cavanaugh***, 306 F.3d 726 (9th Cir. 2002). In *Cavanaugh*, the Ninth Circuit disallowed judicial auctions to select lead plaintiffs in securities class actions, and protected lead plaintiffs' right to select the lead counsel they desire to represent them.
- ***Lone Star Ladies Inv. Club v. Schlotsky's, Inc.***, 238 F.3d 363 (5th Cir. 2001). In *Lone Star Ladies*, the Fifth Circuit upheld investors' claims that securities-offering documents were incomplete and misleading, reversing a district court Order that had applied inappropriate pleading standards to dismiss the case.
- ***Bryant v. Dupree***, 252 F.3d 1161 (11th Cir. 2001). The Eleventh Circuit held that investors were entitled to amend their securities-fraud complaint to reflect further developments in the case, reversing a contrary district court Order.
- ***Bryant v. Avado Brands***, 187 F.3d 1271 (11th Cir. 1999). Interpreting the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, the Eleventh Circuit held that its provision requiring investors to plead facts raising a strong inference of scienter does not abrogate the principle that recklessness suffices to establish liability for violations of §10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.
- ***Berry v. Valence Tech., Inc.***, 175 F.3d 699 (9th Cir. 1999). The Ninth Circuit held that negative articles in the financial press do not cause the one-year "inquiry notice" statute of limitations to run, and indicated possible acceptance of an "actual knowledge" standard that would greatly extend the statute of limitations for victims of securities fraud.
- ***Hertzberg v. Dignity Partners, Inc.***, 191 F.3d 1076 (9th Cir. 1999). The Ninth Circuit reversed dismissal of investors' claims that securities-offering documents were misleading, holding purchasers who bought shares in the aftermarket had standing to bring claims under the Securities Act of 1933 where a material fact is misstated or omitted from a registration statement.
- ***StorMedia, Inc. v. Superior Court***, 20 Cal. 4th 449 (1999). Interpreting the anti-manipulation provisions of California's state securities laws, the California Supreme Court held that a corporation engages in the offer or sale of securities when it maintains an employee stock option or stock purchase plan, and thus may be liable under the statute for disseminating false or misleading public statements.

- ***Diamond Multimedia Sys., Inc. v. Superior Court***, 19 Cal. 4th 1036 (1999). The California Supreme Court held that the California State securities laws' broad anti-manipulation provisions provide a remedy for out-of-state investors damaged by manipulative acts committed within the State of California.

- ***Cooper v. Pickett***, 137 F.3d 616 (9th Cir. 1998). *Cooper* is the leading Ninth Circuit precedent on pleading accounting fraud with particularity. The Court held that plaintiffs stated claims against a company, its independent auditors and its underwriters, for engaging in a scheme to defraud involving improper revenue recognition.

- ***McGann v. Ernst & Young***, 102 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996). *McGann* is a leading federal appellate precedent interpreting Securities Exchange Act of 1934 §10(b)'s provision prohibiting manipulative or deceptive conduct "in connection with" the purchase or sale of a security. The Court rejected contentions that auditors could not be liable for a recklessly misleading audit opinion if they directly participated in no securities transactions. Rather, an accounting firm is subject to liability if it prepares a fraudulent audit report knowing that its client will include the report in an SEC filing.

- ***Provenz v. Miller***, 102 F.3d 1478 (9th Cir. 1996). In *Provenz*, the Ninth Circuit reversed a district court's entry of summary judgment for defendants in an accounting fraud case. The decision is a leading federal appellate precedent on the evidence required to prove fraudulent revenue recognition.

- ***Knapp v. Ernst & Whinney***, 90 F.3d 1431 (9th Cir. 1996). The Ninth Circuit affirmed a jury verdict entered for stock purchasers against a major accounting firm.

- ***Warshaw v. Xoma Corp.***, 74 F.3d 955 (9th Cir. 1996). *Warshaw* is a leading federal appellate precedent on pleading falsity in securities class actions, sustaining allegations that a pharmaceutical company misled securities analysts and investors regarding the efficacy of a new drug and the likelihood of FDA approval. The Court also held that a company may be liable to investors if it misled securities analysts.

- ***Gohler v. Wood***, 919 P.2d 561 (Utah 1996). The Utah Supreme Court held that investors need not plead or prove "reliance" on false or misleading statements in order to recover under a state law prohibiting misleading statements in connection with the sale of a security.

- ***Fecht v. Price Co.***, 70 F.3d 1078 (9th Cir. 1995). *Fecht* is another leading precedent on pleading falsity with particularity. It sustained allegations that a retail chain's positive portrayal of its expansion program was misleading in light of undisclosed problems that caused the program to be curtailed. The Ninth Circuit held that investors may draw on contemporaneous conditions – such as disappointing results and losses in new stores – to explain why a company's optimistic statements were false and misleading. It also clarified the narrow scope of the so-called "bespeaks caution" defense.

- ***In re Software Toolworks Sec. Litig.***, 50 F.3d 615 (9th Cir. 1995). In *Software Toolworks*, the Ninth Circuit reversed the summary judgment entered for defendants, including a company and its top insiders, independent auditors and underwriters. Among other things, the Court held that auditors and underwriters could be liable for their role in drafting a misleading letter sent to the SEC on the corporate defendant's attorneys' letterhead.

- ***In re Pac. Enters. Sec. Litig.***, 47 F.3d 373 (9th Cir. 1995). The Ninth Circuit approved shareholders' settlement of a derivative suit as fair, reasonable, and adequate.

- ***Kaplan v. Rose***, 49 F.3d 1363 (9th Cir. 1994). The Court reversed entry of summary judgment for defendants because investors presented sufficient evidence for a jury to conclude that a medical device did not work as well as defendants claimed.

- ***In re Wells Fargo Sec. Litig.***, 12 F.3d 922 (9th Cir. 1993). *Wells Fargo* is a leading federal appellate decision on pleading accounting fraud, sustaining investors' allegations that a bank misrepresented the adequacy of its loan-loss reserves.

- ***Krangel v. Gen. Dynamics Corp.***, 968 F.2d 914 (9th Cir. 1992). The Ninth Circuit dismissed defendants' appeal from a district court's Order upholding plaintiff investors' choice of forum by remanding the matter to the state court.

- ***Colan v. Mesa Petroleum, Co.***, 951 F.2d 1512 (9th Cir. 1991). In a shareholder derivative action, the Ninth Circuit held that exchange of common stock for debt securities was a "sale" subject to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934's regulation of short-swing profits.

- ***In re Apple Computer Sec. Litig.***, 886 F.2d 1109 (9th Cir. 1989). The Ninth Circuit reversed summary judgment for defendants, holding that investors could proceed to trial on claims that a company's representations about its new disk drive were misleading because they failed to disclose serious technical problems.

- ***Blake v. Dierdorff***, 856 F.2d 1365 (9th Cir. 1988). The Ninth Circuit reversed a district court's dismissal of claims for fraud brought against a corporation's directors and its lawyers.

- ***Mosesian v. Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.***, 727 F.2d 873 (9th Cir. 1984). The Ninth Circuit upheld an investor's right to pursue a class action against an accounting firm, adopting statute of limitation rules for §10(b) suits that are favorable to investors.

ADDITIONALLY, IN THE CONTEXT OF SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE ACTIONS, Lerach Coughlin attorneys have been at the forefront of protecting shareholders' investments by causing important changes in corporate governance as part of the global settlement of such cases. Three recent cases in which such changes were made include:

- ***Teachers' Retirement Sys. of Louisiana v. Occidental Petroleum Corp.***, Case No. BC185009 (Cal. Super. Ct.). As part of the settlement, corporate governance changes were made to the composition of the company's board of directors, the company's nominating committee, compensation committee and audit committee.

- ***In re Sprint Shareholder Litig.***, Case No. 00-CV-230077 (Circuit Ct. Jackson County, Mo.) In connection with the settlement of a derivative action involving Sprint Corporation, the company adopted over 60 new corporate governance provisions, which, among other things, established a truly independent Board of Directors and narrowly defined "independence" to eliminate cronyism between the board and top executives; required outside board directors to meet at least twice a year without management present; created an independent director who will hold the authority to set the agenda, a power previously reserved for the CEO; and imposed new rules to prevent directors and officers from vesting their stock on an accelerated basis.

- **Pirelli Armstrong Tire Corp. Retiree Medical Benefits Trust v. Hanover Compressor Co.**, Case No. H-02-0410 (S.D. Tex.). Groundbreaking corporate governance changes obtained include: direct shareholder nomination of two directors; mandatory rotation of the outside audit firm; two-thirds of the board required to be independent; audit and other key committees to be filled only by independent directors; and creation and appointment of lead independent director with authority to set up board meetings.

Insurance

- **Lebrilla v. Farmers Group, Inc.**, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1070 (2004). Reversing the trial court, the California Court of Appeal ordered class certification of a suit against Farmers, one of the largest automobile insurers in California. The case involves Farmers' practice of using inferior imitation parts when repairing insureds' vehicles.

- **Dehoyos v. Allstate Corp.**, 345 F.3d 290 (5th Cir. 2003), *cert. denied*, 2004 U.S. LEXIS 3088 (Apr. 26, 2004). The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals held that claims under federal civil rights statutes involving the sale of racially discriminatory insurance policies based upon the use of credit scoring did not interfere with state insurance statutes or regulatory goals and were not preempted under the McCarran-Ferguson Act. Specifically, the Appellate Court affirmed the district court's ruling that the McCarran-Ferguson Act does not preempt civil-rights claims under the Civil Rights Act of 1866 and the Fair Housing Act for racially discriminatory business practices in the sale of automobile and homeowners insurance. The U.S. Supreme Court denied defendants' petition for certiorari and plaintiffs can now proceed with their challenge of defendants' allegedly discriminatory credit scoring system used in pricing of automobile and homeowners insurance policies.

- **In re Monumental Life Ins. Co.**, 345 F.3d 408, (5th Cir. 2004). The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed a district court's denial of class certification in a case filed by African-Americans seeking to remedy racially discriminatory insurance practices. The Fifth Circuit held that a monetary relief claim is viable in a Rule 23(b)(2) class if it flows directly from liability to the class as a whole and is capable of classwide "computation by means of objective standards and not dependent in any significant way on the intangible, subjective differences of each class member's circumstances."

- **Moore v. Liberty Nat'l Life Ins. Co.**, 267 F.3d 1209 (11th Cir. 2001). The Eleventh Circuit affirmed the district court's denial of the defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings, rejecting contentions that insurance policyholders' claims of racial discrimination were barred by Alabama's common law doctrine of repose. The Eleventh Circuit also rejected the insurer's argument that the McCarran-Ferguson Act mandated preemption of plaintiffs' federal civil rights claims under 42 U.S.C. §§1981 and 1982.

- **Massachusetts Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. Superior Court**, 97 Cal. App. 4th 1282 (2002). The California Court of Appeal affirmed a trial court's Order certifying a class in an action by purchasers of so-called "vanishing premium" life-insurance policies who claimed violations of California's consumer-protection statutes. The Court held that common issues predominate where plaintiffs allege a uniform failure to disclose material information about policy dividend rates.

Consumer Protection

- ***Kasky v. Nike, Inc.***, 27 Cal. 4th 939 (2002), *cert. dismissed*, 539 U.S. 654 (2003). The California Supreme Court upheld claims that an apparel manufacturer misled the public regarding its exploitative labor practices, thereby violating California statutes prohibiting unfair competition and false advertising. The Court rejected defense contentions that such misconduct was protected by the First Amendment.

- ***West Corp. v. Superior Court***, 116 Cal. App. 4th 1167 (2004). The California Court of Appeal upheld the trial court's finding that jurisdiction in California was appropriate over the out-of-state corporate defendant whose telemarketing was aimed at California residents. Exercise of jurisdiction was found to be in keeping with considerations of fair play and substantial justice.

- ***Spielholz v. Superior Court***, 86 Cal. App. 4th 1366 (2d Dist. 2001). The California Court of Appeal held that false advertising claims against a wireless communications provider are not preempted by the Federal Communications Act of 1934.

- ***Day v. AT & T Corp.***, 63 Cal. App. 4th 325 (1998). The California Court of Appeal held that an action which seeks only to enjoin misleading or deceptive practices in the advertising of telephone rates does not implicate the federal filed-rate doctrine, and can proceed under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§17200 and 17500. The Court also held that the claims were not preempted by the Federal Communications Act, that the California Public Utilities Commission does not have exclusive jurisdiction, that the doctrine of primary jurisdiction did not compel dismissal or stay of the action, and that the plaintiffs were not required to exhaust their administrative remedies.

- ***Mangini v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.***, 7 Cal. 4th 1057 (1994). The California Supreme Court upheld allegations that a cigarette manufacturer committed an unlawful business practice by targeting minors with its advertising. It flatly rejected the manufacturer's contention that the action was preempted by federal cigarette labeling laws.

- ***Jordan v. Dep't of Motor Vehicles***, 75 Cal. App. 4th 449 (1999). The California Court of Appeal invalidated a non-resident vehicle "smog impact" fee imposed on out-of-state autos being registered for the first time in California, finding that the fee violated the Interstate Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution.

- ***Clothesrigger, Inc. v. GTE Corp.***, 191 Cal. App. 3d 605 (1987). The California Court of Appeal reversed the trial court's decision refusing to apply California Law to the claims of nonresident plaintiffs. In reversing the lower court's ruling, the Court found that California Law may constitutionally apply to the claims of proposed nationwide class members who are not residents of California, provided there are significant contacts to the claims asserted by each member.

- ***Lazar v. Hertz Corp.***, 143 Cal. App. 3d 128 (1983). The California Court of Appeal ordered a consumer class certified in an Opinion that significantly broadened the right of injured consumers to bring class actions.

- ***Barr v. United Methodist Church***, 90 Cal. App. 3d 259 (1979). The California Court of Appeal rejected constitutional defenses to an action for civil fraud and breach of contract committed by religiously affiliated defendants.

Antitrust

- ***Law v. NCAA***, 134 F.3d 1010 (10th Cir. 1998). The Tenth Circuit upheld summary judgment on liability for plaintiffs in college coaches' antitrust action against the National Collegiate Athletic Association on the issue of antitrust liability under §1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. §1 (plaintiffs subsequently prevailed on a damages trial). It also upheld the district court's Order permanently enjoining the NCAA from enforcing the "restricted earnings coach" rule, through which NCAA member institutions limited the salary of certain coaches to \$12,000 during the academic year.

- ***In re NASDAQ Market-Makers Antitrust Litig.***, 172 F.R.D. 119 (S.D.N.Y. 1997). In a case where plaintiffs alleged that approximately 30 NASDAQ market-makers engaged in a conspiracy to restrain or eliminate price competition, the District Court certified a class of millions of investors – including institutional investors to be represented by five public pension funds.

- ***In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litig.***, 170 F.R.D. 524 (M.D. Fla. 1996). Plaintiff contact lens purchasers alleged that defendant manufacturers conspired on a nationwide basis to eliminate competition and maintain artificially inflated prices for replacement contact lenses. The District Court denied defendant manufacturers' motion to dismiss plaintiffs' Clayton Act claims and granted their motion for class certification, finding that plaintiffs' vertical-conspiracy evidence was general to the class and provided a colorable method of proving impact on the class at trial.

- ***In re Currency Conversion Fee Antitrust Litig.***, 265 F. Supp. 2d 385 (S.D.N.Y. 2003). In a case consolidating more than 20 putative class actions, plaintiff credit card holders alleged that two credit-card networks, Visa and MasterCard, and their member banks, conspired to fix the foreign-currency conversion fees they charged. The District Court found that plaintiffs pleaded facts sufficient to permit the inference of an antitrust conspiracy, denying defendants' motion to dismiss the antitrust allegations.

- ***Pharmacare v. Caremark***, 965 F. Supp. 1411 (D. Haw. 1996). The District Court denied defendant's motion to dismiss plaintiffs' Robinson-Patman Act claim in a case where the largest company in the alternate-site infusion therapy industry had pleaded guilty to mail fraud for making improper payments to physicians in exchange for their referrals of patients. Plaintiffs, defendant's competitors, alleged that they suffered injury as a result of defendant's agreements, which violated the anti-kickback provisions of the Clayton Act, §2(c) as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, 15 U.S.C. §13(c).

THE FIRM'S PARTNERS

WILLIAM S. LERACH is widely recognized as one of the leading securities lawyers in the United States. He has headed the prosecution of hundreds of securities class and stockholder derivative actions resulting in recoveries for defrauded shareholders amounting to billions of dollars. Mr. Lerach has been the subject of considerable media attention and is a frequent commentator on securities and corporate law, as well as a frequent lecturer. He represents numerous public and multi-employer pension funds in corporate securities matters.

He is the author of *Plundering America: How American Investors Got Taken for Trillions by Corporate Insiders - The Rise of the New Corporate Kleptocracy*, 8 Stanford J. of Law, Bus. and Fin. 1 (2002); *Why Insiders Get Rich, and the Little Guy Loses*, L.A. Times, Jan. 20, 2002; *The Chickens Have Come Home to Roost: How Wall Street, the Big Accounting Firms and Corporate Interests Chloroformed Congress and Cost America's Investors Trillions; Achieving Corporate Governance Enhancements Through Litigation*, keynote address to Council of Institutional Investors spring meeting, Mar. 27, 2001; *The Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 - 27 Months Later: Securities Class Action Litigation Under The Private Securities Litigation Reform Act's Brave New World*, Washington U. L. Rev., Vol. 76, No. 2 (1998); *An Alarming Decline In the Quality of Financial Reporting* (unpublished paper presented to 7th Annual BusinessWeek CFO Forum (June 1998); co author of *Civil RICO in Shareholders Suits Involving Defense Contractors* in Civil RICO Practice: Causes of Action, published by John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (1991); *The Incorporation Trap: How Delaware Has Destroyed Corporate Governance* (unpublished paper presented to the Council of Institutional Investors (1990)); *Securities Class Actions and Derivative Litigations Involving Public Companies: A Plaintiff's Perspective*, ALI/ABI, Civil Practice and Litigation in Federal and State Courts

(1985), ABA Fall Meeting (1985) and PLI Securities Litigation, Prosecution and Defense Strategies (1985); *Alternative Approaches for Awarding Attorneys' Fees in Federal Court Litigation: It's Time to Unload the Lodestar* (unpublished paper presented to the Ninth Circuit Judicial Conference (1984)); *Class Action and Derivative Suits in the Aftermath of Control Contests, Mergers and Acquisitions: Choice of Forum and Remedies; Attorney/Client Privilege in Class and Derivative Cases*, ABA 1984 Annual Meeting (1984); *Class Actions: Plaintiffs' Perspectives, Tactics and Problems*, ALI/ABA, Civil Practice and Litigation in Federal and State Courts (1984); *Life After Huddleston: Streamlining and Simplification of the Securities Class Action*, 7 Class Action Reports 318 (1982). He is also the author of *Termination of Class Actions: The Judicial Role*, McGough & Lerach, 33 U. Pitt L. Rev. 446 (1972); *Class and Derivative Actions Under the Federal Securities Laws* (1980 Regents of the University of California).

Mr. Lerach is chief counsel in many of the largest and highest profile securities class action and corporate derivative suits in recent years, including *Enron*, *Dynegy*, *Qwest* and *WorldCom*. He is listed in the "Best Lawyers in America" and is a Master of the American Inns of Court. Mr. Lerach has been the President of the National Association of Securities and Commercial Lawyers (NASCAT), a national group of attorneys concentrating in commercial and securities litigation. Mr. Lerach is a member of the Editorial Board of Class Action Reports and frequently lectures on class and derivative actions, accountants' liability, and attorneys' fees, and has been a guest lecturer at Stanford University, University of California at Los Angeles and San Diego, University of Pittsburgh, San Diego State University and at the Council of Institutional Investors and the International Corporate Governance Network. He is also a member of

the American Law Institute faculty on Federal and State Class Action Litigation.

Mr. Lerach received his Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Pittsburgh in 1967 and his Juris Doctor degree in 1970 where he graduated second in his class, *magna cum laude*, and was a member of the Order of the Coif. The University recently bestowed one of its highest awards on Mr. Lerach, designating him a "Legacy Laureate" as one of the University's most outstanding graduates. Mr. Lerach was admitted to the Pennsylvania Bar in 1970 and to the California Bar in 1976. Mr. Lerach was a partner with Pittsburgh firm Reed Smith Shaw & McClay before moving to California. Mr. Lerach serves as Chairman of Lerach Coughlin. He is a member of the Pennsylvania and California Bar Associations and has been admitted to practice before numerous federal and state courts. He is a member of the ABA Litigation Section's Committee on Class Actions and Derivative Skills.

Mr. Lerach has testified before federal and state legislative committees concerning corporate governance and securities matters and is frequently quoted in the national media regarding corporate issues.

Mr. Lerach was honored by President Clinton who appointed him to be a member of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council.

PATRICK J. COUGHLIN is the firm's Chief Trial Counsel, and has been lead counsel for several major securities matters, including one of the largest class action securities cases to go to trial, *In re Apple Computer Sec. Litig.*, Case No. C-84-20148(A)-JW (N.D. Cal.). Mr. Coughlin has argued in the United States Supreme Court on behalf of shareholders, *Dura Pharms., Inc. v. Broudo*, 544 U.S. 336 (2005), in which an important decision was issued by the high court concerning loss causation in securities cases. Although the Court overruled established 9th Circuit precedent, the decision

is widely regarded as a favorable one for investors alleging fraud.

Formerly, Mr. Coughlin was an Assistant United States Attorney in the District of Columbia and the Southern District of California, handling complex white collar fraud matters. During this time, Mr. Coughlin helped try one of the largest criminal RICO cases ever prosecuted by the United States, *United States v. Brown, et al.*, Case No. 86-3056-SWR, as well as an infamous oil fraud scheme resulting in a complex murder-for-hire trial, *United States v. Boeckman, et al.*, Case No. 87-0676-K.

Mr. Coughlin's recent trials involving securities violations include cases against Wells Fargo and California Amplifier. Cases that settled on the eve of trial include cases against Alcatel and America West. Throughout his career, Mr. Coughlin has tried more than 50 jury and non-jury trials. Mr. Coughlin tried one of the largest private RICO trials against the major tobacco companies on behalf of hundreds of thousands of Ohio Taft-Hartley health and welfare fund participants. Mr. Coughlin also helped end the Joe Camel ad campaign, a cartoon ad campaign that targeted children and secured a \$12.5 billion recovery for the Cities and Counties of California in the landmark 1998 state settlement with the tobacco companies.

JOHN J. STOIA, JR. received his Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Tulsa in 1983. While working on his degree, Mr. Stoia was elected President of the National Political Science Honor Society and graduated with highest honors. In 1986, Mr. Stoia received his Juris Doctor degree from the University of Tulsa and graduated in the top of his class.

In 1987, Mr. Stoia graduated from the Georgetown University Law Center in Washington, D.C., receiving his Masters of Law in Securities Regulation. Thereafter, Mr. Stoia served as an enforcement attorney with the

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. Mr. Stoia is one of the founding partners of Lerach Coughlin.

Mr. Stoia worked on numerous nationwide complex securities class actions, including *In re Am. Cont. Corp./Lincoln Sav. & Loan Sec. Litig.*, MDL No. 834 (D. Ariz.), which arose out of the collapse of Lincoln Savings & Loan and Charles Keating's empire. Mr. Stoia was a member of plaintiffs' trial team which obtained verdicts against Mr. Keating and his co-defendants in excess of \$3 billion and settlements of over \$240 million.

Mr. Stoia was involved in over 40 nationwide class actions brought by policyholders against U.S. and Canadian life insurance companies seeking redress for deceptive sales practices during the 1980s and 1990s. Mr. Stoia was actively involved in cases against, among others, Prudential, New York Life, Transamerica Life Insurance Company, General American Life Insurance Company, Manufacturer's Life, Metropolitan Life, American General, US Life, Allianz, Principal Life and Pacific Life Insurance Company.

Mr. Stoia was also involved in numerous cases brought against life insurance companies for racial discrimination involving the sale of small value or "industrial life" insurance policies during the 20th century. Mr. Stoia was lead counsel in *McNeil, et al., v. Am. Gen. Life Ins. and Accident Ins. Co.*, the first major settlement involving discrimination claims which resulted in a \$234 million recovery for class members. Mr. Stoia resolved other race-based insurance cases, including *Brown v. United Life Ins. Co.* (\$40 million), *Morris v. Life Ins. Co. of Georgia* (\$55 million) and *Thompson v. Metropolitan Life* (\$145 million).

Mr. Stoia currently represents numerous large institutional investors who suffered hundreds of millions of dollars in losses as a result of the major financial scandals, including WorldCom and AOL-Time Warner.

Mr. Stoia is a frequent lecturer at ALI-ABA, Practicing Law Institute and American Trial Lawyers Association seminars and conferences: Speaker, *ALI-ABA Program: Life and Health Insurance Litigation*; Co-chair, *ALI-ABA Program: Financial Services and Insurance Industry Litigation*; Speaker, *ATLA Winter Convention – Securities Fraud: Rights and Remedies of Shareholders*; Speaker, *ATLA Annual Convention – Insurance Law Section*, Panel: Broker/Dealer Liability; Speaker, *ACI Consumer Finance Class Actions Conference*; Speaker, *Barreau du Quebec Class Action Seminar*.

UPCOMING SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS

March 18, 2005

New York: ALI-ABA Program: Financial Services and Insurance Industry Litigation

July 24, 2005

Toronto: ATLA Annual Convention – Insurance Law Section, Panel: Broker/Dealer Liability

September 26, 2005

New York: ACI Consumer Finance Class Actions Conference

October 21, 2005

Quebec: Barreau du Quebec Class Action Seminar

March 30-31, 2006

DC: ALI-ABA Conference on Life Insurance and Financial Services Industry Litigation

May 1, 2006

Kona: IBA West Blue Ribbon Conference

May 10-11, 2007

Chicago: Conference on Insurance Industry Litigation 2007 (ALI-ABA)

July 27-28, 2006

New York: PLI Class Action Litigation Prosecution and Defense Strategies

PAUL J. GELLER received his Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology from the University of Florida, where he was a member of the University Honors Program. Mr. Geller then earned his Juris Doctor degree, with highest honors, from Emory University School of Law. At Emory, Mr. Geller was an Editor of the *Law Review*, was inducted into the Order of the Coif legal honor society, and was awarded multiple American Jurisprudence Book Awards for earning the highest grade in the school in a dozen courses.

After spending several years representing blue chip companies in class action lawsuits at one of the largest corporate defense firms in the world, Mr. Geller was a founding partner and head of the Boca Raton offices of the national class action boutiques Cauley Geller Bowman & Rudman, LLP and Geller Rudman, PLLC. In June 2004, through a merger of Lerach Coughlin and Geller Rudman, PLLC, Mr. Geller opened the Boca Raton, Florida office of the firm.

In July 2002, Mr. Geller was named by the *National Law Journal* as one of the nation's "40 Under 40" – an honor bestowed upon 40 of the country's top young litigators. In July 2003, Mr. Geller was featured in *Florida Trend* magazine and the *South Florida Business Journal* as one of Florida's top lawyers.

Mr. Geller is rated AV by Martindale Hubbell (the highest rating available) and has served as lead or co-lead counsel in a majority of the securities class actions that have been filed in the southeastern United States in the past several years, including cases against *Hamilton Bancorp* (\$8.5 million settlement); *Prison Realty Trust* (co-lead derivative counsel; total combined settlement of over \$120 million), and *Intermedia Corp.* (\$38 million settlement). Mr. Geller is currently one of the court-appointed lead counsel in cases involving the alleged manipulation of the asset value of

some of the nation's largest mutual funds, including *Hicks v. Morgan Stanley & Co.*, Case No. 01 Civ. 10071 (S.D.N.Y.); *Abrams v. Van Kampen Funds, Inc.*, Case No. 01 C 7538 (N.D. Ill.), and *In re Eaton Vance Sec. Litig.*, Case No. C.A. No. 01-10911 (D. Mass.). Mr. Geller is also heavily involved in corporate governance litigation. For example, Mr. Geller represented a shareholder of Applica, Inc. who was concerned with allegedly reckless acquisitions made by the company. Mr. Geller and his partners secured a settlement that required Applica to establish a new independent acquisitions committee charged with conducting due diligence and approving future acquisitions, even though such a committee is not required by SEC regulations. In another corporate governance lawsuit, Mr. Geller and his co-counsel challenged the independence of certain members of a special committee empaneled by Oracle Corp. to look into certain stock sales made by its Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Larry Ellison. After Delaware Chancery Court Vice Chancellor Leo E. Strine issued an Order agreeing that the special committee was "fraught with conflicts," the *Wall Street Journal* called the decision "one of the most far-reaching ever on corporate governance."

Mr. Geller has also successfully represented consumers in class action litigation. He was personal counsel to the lead plaintiff in *Stoddard v. Advanta*, a case that challenged the adequacies of interest rate disclosures by one of the nation's largest credit card companies (\$11 million settlement), and was personal counsel to one of the lead plaintiffs in the American Family Publishers sweepstakes litigation, which alleged that the defendant misled consumers into thinking they would win a lottery if they purchased magazine subscriptions (\$38 million settlement).

During the past few years, several of Mr. Geller's cases have received regional and national press coverage. Mr. Geller has appeared on CNN's Headline News, CNN's

Moneyline with Lou Dobbs, ABC, NBC and FOX network news programs. Mr. Geller is regularly quoted in the financial press, including the *New York Times*, the *Wall Street Journal*, the *Washington Post* and *Business Week*.

Mr. Geller has been or is a member of the Association of Trial Lawyers of America, the Practising Law Institute, the American Bar Association, the Palm Beach County Bar Association (former Member of Bar Grievance Committee) and the South Palm Beach County Bar Association (former Co-Chair of Pro Bono Committee).

SAMUEL H. RUDMAN received his Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science from Binghamton University in 1989 and earned his Juris Doctor degree from Brooklyn Law School in 1992. While at Brooklyn Law School, Mr. Rudman was a Dean's Merit Scholar and a member of the *Brooklyn Journal of International Law* and the Moot Court Honor Society.

Upon graduation from law school, Mr. Rudman joined the Enforcement Division of the United States Securities & Exchange Commission in its New York Regional Office as a staff attorney. In this position, Mr. Rudman was responsible for numerous investigations and prosecutions of violations of the federal securities laws. Thereafter, Mr. Rudman joined one of the largest corporate law firms in the country, where he represented public companies in the defense of securities class actions and also handled several white-collar criminal defense matters.

Since joining the firm, Mr. Rudman has been responsible for the investigation and initiation of securities and shareholder class actions. In addition, Mr. Rudman developed a focus in the area of lead plaintiff jurisprudence and has been responsible for numerous reported decisions in this area of securities law.

Mr. Rudman continues to focus his practice in the area of investigating and initiating securities and shareholder class actions and also devotes a considerable amount of time to representing clients in ongoing securities litigation.

DARREN J. ROBBINS received his Bachelor of Science and Master of Arts degrees in Economics from the University of Southern California. Mr. Robbins received his Juris Doctor degree from Vanderbilt Law School, where he served as the Managing Editor of the *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*.

Mr. Robbins oversees Lerach Coughlin's merger and acquisition practice. Mr. Robbins has extensive experience in federal and state securities class action litigation. Mr. Robbins served as one of the lead counsel in the *In re Prison Realty Sec. Litig.* (\$120+ million recovery), *In re Dollar Gen. Sec. Litig.* (\$172.5 million recovery) and *Pirelli Armstrong Tire Corp. Retiree Med. Benefits Trust v. Hanover Compressor Co.* (\$85+ million recovery). Mr. Robbins currently represents institutional and individual investors in securities actions in state and federal courts across the country, including The Regents of the University of California in the *Enron* litigation and numerous public pension funds in the *WorldCom* bond litigation.

Mr. Robbins is a frequent speaker at conferences and seminars concerning securities matters and shareholder litigation across the country.

KEITH F. PARK graduated from the University of California at Santa Barbara in 1968 and from the Hastings College of Law of the University of California in 1972.

Mr. Park is responsible for the recoveries in more than 1,000 securities class actions, including actions involving: Dollar General (\$162 million recovery); Mattel (\$122 million recovery); Prison Realty (\$105 million recovery); Honeywell (in addition to the \$100 million recovery, obtained Honeywell's agreement to adopt significant corporate governance changes relating to compensation of senior executives and directors, stock trading by directors, executive officers and key employees, internal and external audit functions, and financial reporting and board independence); Sprint (in addition to \$50 million recovery, obtained important governance enhancements, including creation of "Lead Independent Director" and expensing of stock options); Hanover Compressor (on top of \$85 million recovery, obtained the following governance enhancements, among others: direct shareholder nomination of Board and mandatory rotation of audit firm); 3COM (\$259 million recovery); Chiron (\$43 million recovery); MedPartners (\$56 million recovery); NME (\$60.75 million recovery); and TCI (\$26.5 million recovery).

He is admitted to practice in California and New York.

HELEN J. HODGES received her Bachelor of Science degree in accounting from Oklahoma State University in 1979. While attending Oklahoma State, Ms. Hodges obtained her private pilot's license and in 1980 was a member of Oklahoma State's flying team, which won top honors at the National Intercollegiate Flying Association competition. Ms. Hodges became a certified public accountant in 1982 and received her Juris Doctor degree from the University of Oklahoma in 1983, where she was the Managing Editor of the *Law Review*. She was

admitted to the State Bars of Oklahoma in 1983 and California in 1987.

Ms. Hodges was a staff accountant with Arthur Andersen & Co. and served as the law clerk for the *Penn Square* cases in the Western District of Oklahoma. Ms. Hodges has been involved in numerous securities class actions, including: *Knapp v. Gomez*, Civ. No. 87-0067-H(M) (S.D. Cal.), in which a plaintiffs' verdict was returned in a Rule 10b-5 class action; *National Health Labs*, which was settled for \$64 million; and *Thurber v. Mattel*, which was settled for \$122 million.

REED R. KATHREIN is a partner in the San Francisco office of Lerach Coughlin. Mr. Kathrein received his Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Miami, *cum laude*, in 1974 and received his Juris Doctor degree in 1977. He served as Editor-in-Chief of the *International Law Journal*. For the past 15 years, he has focused his practice on complex and class action litigation, principally involving securities or consumer fraud. He was lead counsel in numerous state as well as federal court actions around the country, including co-lead counsel in the *In re 3Com Sec. Litig.*, which settled for \$259 million.

Mr. Kathrein publishes and lectures extensively in the fields of litigation, consumer and securities law, class actions, and international law. He annually co-chairs the Executive Enterprises program for corporate officers and counsel entitled, "Dealing With Analysts and the Press." He has spoken to the American Bar Association, the American Business Trial Lawyers Association, the Consumer Attorneys of California, the Practising Law Institute, the Securities Law Institute, the National Investor Relations Institute, state and local bar groups, private seminar organizations and corporations. He testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on behalf of the American Bar Association in favor of advice and consent to ratification of treaties on international sales, arbitration, evidence and

service of process. He testified before the California Assembly and Senate Committees on Y2K litigation, the unfair trade practice act and changes in the business judgment rule. He actively fought the passage of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 and the Securities Litigation Uniform Standard Act of 1998. He worked behind the scenes to shape the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 on corporate responsibility and accountability.

He served as chairman of the Private International Law Committee of the American Bar Association from 1984-1990, as a director and officer of the International Business Counsel Mid-America from 1983-1988, where he also chaired the policy committee. He acted as an advisor to the U.S. State Department's Advisory Committee on Private International Law from 1984-1990. He is a member of the executive committee of the National Association of Securities and Commercial Law Attorneys, and since 1998 has been a member of the Board of Governors of the Consumer Attorneys of California.

Formerly, Mr. Kathrein was a partner in the Chicago law firm Arnstein & Lehr, where he represented national and international corporations in litigation involving antitrust, commercial, toxic tort, employment and product and public liability disputes. Mr. Kathrein graduated from the University of Miami in 1977, where he received his Bachelor of Arts degree, *cum laude*. He served as Editor-in-Chief of the *International Law Journal*. He is admitted to the Bar of the States of Illinois (1977), Florida (1978) and California (1989).

ERIC ALAN ISAACSON received his A.B. *summa cum laude* from Ohio University in 1982. He earned his Juris Doctor with high honors from the Duke University School of Law in 1985 and was elected to the Order of the Coif. Mr. Isaacson served as a Note and Comment Editor for the *Duke Law Journal*, and in his third year of law school became a member of the Moot

Court Board. After graduation, Mr. Isaacson clerked for the Honorable J. Clifford Wallace of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

In 1986, Mr. Isaacson joined the litigation department of O'Melveny & Myers, where his practice included cases involving allegations of trademark infringement, unfair business practices and securities fraud. He served as a member of the trial team that successfully prosecuted a major trademark infringement action.

Mr. Isaacson has taken part in prosecuting many securities fraud class actions. He was a member of the plaintiffs' trial team in *In re Apple Computer Sec. Litig.*, Case No. C 84-20198(A)-JW (N.D. Cal.).

Since the early 1990s, his practice has focused on appellate matters in cases before the California Courts of Appeal, the California Supreme Court, the United States Court of Appeals and the United States Supreme Court. See, e.g., *In re Daou Sys., Inc., Sec. Litig.*, 411 F.3d 1006 (9th Cir. 2005); *Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund v. CitiGroup, Inc.*, 391 F.3d 844 (7th Cir. 2004); *Lone Star Ladies Inv. Club v. Schlotzsky's Inc.*, 238 F.3d 363 (5th Cir. 2001); *Hertzberg v. Dignity Partners, Inc.*, 191 F.3d 1076 (9th Cir. 1999); *Warshaw v. Xoma Corp.*, 74 F.3d 955 (9th Cir. 1996); *Fecht v. Price Co.*, 70 F.3d 1078 (9th Cir. 1995); *Mangini v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.*, 7 Cal. 4th 1057 (1994).

Mr. Isaacson's publications include: *What's Brewing in Dura?* (coauthored with Patrick J. Coughlin and Joseph D. Daley), *Loyola University Chicago Law Journal* (publication forthcoming in 2005); *Duped Investors See "Dura" as Diamond in the Rough*, (coauthored with Patrick J. Coughlin and Joseph D. Daley), *Los Angeles Daily Journal*, July 5, 2005, p. 8; *Pleading Scierter Under Section 21D(b)(2) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934: Motive, Opportunity, Recklessness and the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995* (co-

authored with William S. Lerach), 33 San Diego Law Rev. 893 (1996); *Securities Class Actions in the United States* (co-authored with Patrick J. Coughlin), in William G. Horton & Gerhard Wegen, editors, *Litigation Issues in the Distribution of Securities: An International Perspective* 399 (Kluwer International/International Bar Association, 1997); *Pleading Standards Under the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995: The Central District of California's Chantal Decision* (co-authored with Alan Schulman & Jennifer Wells), Class Action & Derivative Suits, Summer 1996, at 14; *Commencing Litigation Under the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995* (co-authored with Patrick J. Coughlin), in Jay B. Kasner & Bruce G. Vanyo, editors, *Securities Litigation* 1996, 9-22 (Practicing Law Institute 1996); *The Flag Burning Issue: A Legal Analysis and Comment*, 23 Loyola of Los Angeles Law Rev. 535 (1990).

Mr. Isaacson also has received awards for *pro bono* work from the California Star Bar and the San Diego Volunteer Lawyer Program. He has filed *amicus curiae* briefs on behalf of a variety of organizations, including the Social Justice Committee and Board of Trustees of the First Unitarian Universalist Church of San Diego. Since January 2004, Mr. Isaacson has served as a member of the Board of Directors – and since March 2005 as Board President – of the San Diego Foundation for Change, an organization dedicated to funding and supporting community-led efforts that promote social equality, economic justice, and environmental sustainability. Its grantees have included groups as diverse as Activist San Diego, the Interfaith Committee for Worker Justice, and the San Diego Audubon Society.

Mr. Isaacson has been a member of the California Bar since 1985. He is also admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court, the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh Circuits,

and before all federal district courts in the State of California.

MARK SOLOMON earned his law degrees at Trinity College, Cambridge University, England (1985), Harvard Law School (1986), and the Inns of Court School of Law, England (1987). He is admitted to the Bar of England and Wales (Barrister), Ohio and California, as well as to various U.S. Federal District and Appellate Courts. Mr. Solomon regularly represents both U.S. - and U.K. - based pension funds and asset managers in class and non-class securities litigation. Mr. Solomon is a founding partner of Lerach Coughlin.

Before studying law in England, Mr. Solomon served as a British police officer. After qualifying as a barrister, he first practiced at the international firm Jones Day in Cleveland, Ohio (1987-1990), followed by practice at the Los Angeles office of New York's Stroock & Stroock & Lavan (1990-1993). At those firms, Mr. Solomon's representations included the defense of securities fraud and other white-collar crimes, antitrust, copyright, commercial and real estate litigation and reinsurance arbitration. While practicing in Los Angeles, acting for plaintiffs, Mr. Solomon took to trial and won complex commercial contract and real estate actions in the Orange County and Los Angeles Superior Courts, respectively.

Since 1993, Mr. Solomon has spearheaded the prosecution of many significant cases. He has obtained substantial recoveries and judgments for plaintiffs through settlement, summary adjudications and trial. He litigated, through trial, *In re Helionetics*, where he and his trial partner, Paul Howes, won a unanimous \$15.4 million jury verdict in November 2000. He has successfully led many other cases, among them: *Schwartz v. TXU et al.* (\$150 million recovery plus significant corporate governance reforms); *In re Informix Corp. Sec. Litig.* (\$142 million recovery); *Rosen, et al. v. Macromedia, Inc.* (\$48 million recovery); *In re Community Psychiatric Ctrs Sec. Litig.* (\$42.5 million

recovery); *In re Advanced Micro Devices Sec. Litig.* (\$34 million recovery); *In re Tele-Communications, Inc. Sec. Litig.* (\$33 million recovery); *In re Home Theater Sec. Litig.* (\$22.5 million judgment); *In re Diamond Multimedia Sec. Litig.* (\$18 million recovery); *Hayley, et al. v. Parker, et al.* (\$16.4 million recovery); *In re Gupta Corp. Sec. Litig.* (\$15 million recovery); *In re Radius Sec. Litig.*; *In re SuperMac Tech., Inc. Sec. Litig.* (combined recovery of \$14 million); *Markus, et al. v. The North Face, et al.* (\$12.5 million recovery); *In re Brothers Gourmet Coffees, Inc. Sec. Litig.* (\$9 million recovery); *Anderson, et al. v. EFTC, et al.* (\$9 million recovery); *In re Flir Sys. Inc. Sec. Litig.* (\$6 million recovery); *In re Nike, Inc. Sec. Litig.* (\$8.9 million recovery); *Sharma v. Insignia* (\$8 million recovery); and *In re Medeva Sec. Litig.* (\$6.75 million recovery).

Mr. Solomon chaired the American Bar Association Directors and Officers Liability Subcommittee and the Accountants Liability Subcommittee between 1996 and 2001.

RANDI D. BANDMAN is a partner at Lerach Coughlin whose responsibilities include the management of the Los Angeles office and the firm's Institutional Investor Department. Ms. Bandman received her Juris Doctor degree from the University of Southern California in 1989 and her Bachelor of Arts degree in English from the University of California at Los Angeles in 1986. Having been associated with the Lerach Coughlin lawyers for more than 14 years, Ms. Bandman's practice has focused on securities and consumer class actions in both state and federal court. She has represented shareholders of companies in industries as diverse as aircraft manufacturing, battery technology, and computer software. These cases, which yielded significant recoveries for the plaintiffs, were against such companies as: WorldCom (\$650 million); National Health Labs (\$64 million); Sybase (\$28.5 million) and Unocal (\$47.5 million). Ms. Bandman was responsible for running one of the largest class actions in the country over a four-year period against the

Boeing Company, which settled for more than \$90 million. Ms. Bandman was also an early member of the team that directed the prosecution of the cases against the tobacco companies.

Using her extensive experience in asserting claims for injured investors, Ms. Bandman lectures and advises multi-employer and public pension funds both domestically and internationally on their options for seeking redress for losses due to fraud sustained in their portfolios. Ms. Bandman is currently interfacing with numerous public and Taft-Hartley pension funds, including those workers for various States and Municipalities, the Entertainment Industry, Sheetmetal Workers, Construction, Air Conditioning, Food and Hospitality, and Plumbers and Teamsters.

Ms. Bandman has served as a lecturer on numerous matters concerning securities litigation to attorneys for continuing legal education, as well as a panelist for the Practicing Law Institute.

THEODORE J. PINTAR received his Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of California at Berkeley in 1984 where he studied Political Economies of Industrial Societies. Mr. Pintar received his Juris Doctor degree from the University of Utah College of Law in 1987, where he was Note and Comment Editor of the *Journal of Contemporary Law* and the *Journal of Energy Law and Policy*. Formerly, Mr. Pintar was associated with the firm of McKenna, Conner & Cuneo in Los Angeles, California, where he focused in commercial and government contracts defense litigation. Mr. Pintar is co-author of *Assuring Corporate Compliance with Federal Contract Laws and Regulations*, Corporate Criminal Liability Reporter, Vol. 2 (Spring 1988).

Mr. Pintar participated in the successful prosecution of numerous securities fraud class actions and derivative actions, including participation on the trial team in *Knapp v.*

Gomez, Case No. 87-0067-H(M) (S.D. Cal.), which resulted in a plaintiff's verdict. Mr. Pintar also participated in the successful prosecution of numerous consumer class actions, including: (i) actions against major life insurance companies such as Manulife (\$555 million settlement value) and Principal Life Insurance Company (\$379 million settlement value); (ii) actions against major homeowners insurance companies such as Allstate (\$50 million settlement) and Prudential Property and Casualty Co. (\$7 million settlement); and (iii) actions against Columbia House (\$55 million settlement value) and BMG (\$10 million settlement value), a direct marketer of CDs and cassettes.

Mr. Pintar is a member of the State Bar of California and the San Diego County Bar Association.

JOY ANN BULL received her Juris Doctor degree, *magna cum laude*, from the University of San Diego in 1988. She was a member of the University of San Diego National Trial Competition Team and the *San Diego Law Review*. Ms. Bull focuses on the litigation of complex securities and consumer class actions. For nine years, Ms. Bull has concentrated her practice in negotiating and documenting complex settlement agreements and obtaining the required court approval of the settlements and payment of attorneys' fees. These settlements include: *In re Dole Shareholders' Litig.*, Case No. BC281949 (Cal. Super. Ct., Los Angeles County) (\$172 million recovery plus injunctive relief); *Lindmark v. Am. Express*, Case No. 00-8658-JFW(CWx) (C.D. Cal.) (\$38 million cash payment plus injunctive relief); *In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1030 (M.D. Fla.) (cash and benefits package over \$90 million plus injunctive relief); *In re LifeScan, Inc. Consumer Litig.*, Case No. C-98-20321-JF(EAI) (N.D. Cal.) (\$45 million cash recovery); *In re Bergen Brunswig Corp. Sec. Litig.*, Case No. SACV-99-1305-AHS(ANx) (C.D. Cal.) (\$27.9 million cash recovery); *Hall v. NCAA*, Case No. 94-2392-KHV (D. Kan.) (\$54.4

million cash recovery); *In re Glen Ivy Resorts, Inc.*, Case No. SD92-16083MG (Banker. Ct. C.D. Cal.) (\$31 million cash recovery); and *In re Advanced Micro Devices Sec. Litig.*, Case No. C-93-20662-RPA(PVT) (N.D. Cal.) (\$34 million cash recovery).

BONNY E. SWEENEY received her Bachelor of Arts degree from Whittier College in 1981 and a Master of Arts degree from Cornell University in 1985. She graduated *summa cum laude* from Case Western Reserve University School of Law in 1988, where she served as an editor of the *Law Review* and was elected to the Order of the Coif.

Formerly, Ms. Sweeney practiced in the litigation department of the Boston law firm of Foley, Hoag & Eliot. Ms. Sweeney concentrates her practice in antitrust and unfair competition litigation. Ms. Sweeney participated in the prosecution of several antitrust and unfair competition cases that have resulted in significant settlements, including: *In re NASDAQ Market-Makers Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1023 (S.D.N.Y.), which settled for \$1.027 billion in 1997, the largest antitrust settlement ever; *In re Airline Ticket Comm'n Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1058 (D. Minn.), which settled for more than \$85 million in 1996; and *In re LifeScan, Inc. Consumer Litig.*, No. C-98-20321-JF(EAI) (N.D. Cal.), which settled just before trial for \$45 million. Ms. Sweeney was also one of the trial counsel for a class of coaches in *Hall v. NCAA*, Case No. 94-2392-KHV (D. Kan.), an antitrust class action that resulted in a \$67 million jury verdict in three consolidated cases after a three-week trial.

Ms. Sweeney has served on the Executive Committee of the Antitrust and Unfair Competition Law Section of the California State Bar since 2002 and is currently Vice Chair of Antitrust Programs. She also lectures on California's Unfair Competition Law and antitrust topics. In 2003, Ms. Sweeney was a recipient of the Wiley M. Manuel Pro Bono

Services Award and the San Diego Volunteer Lawyer Program Distinguished Service Award.

Ms. Sweeney is admitted to practice in California and Massachusetts, and is a member of the Antitrust Section of the American Bar Association, the Antitrust and Unfair Competition Section of the California Bar Association and the San Diego County Bar Association.

TRAVIS E. DOWNS III received his Bachelor of Arts degree in History, *cum laude*, from Whitworth College in 1985, and received his Juris Doctor degree from University of Washington School of Law in 1990. Mr. Downs concentrates his practice in securities class actions and shareholders' derivative actions.

Mr. Downs is responsible for the prosecution and recovery of significant settlements in the following cases: *In re Informix Corp. Sec. Litig.*, Case No. C-97-1289-CRB (N.D. Cal.) (\$137.5 million recovery); *In re MP3.com, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, Case No. 00-CV-1873-K(NLS) (S.D. Cal.) (\$36 million recovery); *In re Conner Peripherals, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, Case No. C-95-2244-MHP (N.D. Cal.) (\$26 million recovery); *In re Silicon Graphics, Inc. II Sec. Litig.*, Case No. 97-4362-SI (N.D. Cal.) (\$20.3 million recovery); *In re J.D. Edwards Sec. Litig.*, Case No. 99-N-1744 (D. Colo.) (\$15 million recovery); *In re Sony Corp. Sec. Litig.*, Case No. CV-96-1326-JGD(JGx) (C.D. Cal.) (\$12.5 million recovery); *In re Veterinary Ctrs. of Am., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, Case No. 97-4244-CBM(MCx) (C.D. Cal.) (\$6.75 million recovery); *In re JDN Realty Corp. Derivative Litig.*, Case No. 00-CV-1853 (N.D. Ga.) (obtained extensive corporate governance enhancements); *In re Hollywood Entertainment Corp. Sec. Litig.*, Case No. 95-1926-MA (D. Or.) (\$15 million recovery); *In re Legato Sys., Inc. Derivative Litig.*, Case No. 413050 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Mateo Cty.) (obtained extensive corporate governance enhancements); and *In re Flagstar Cos., Inc. Derivative Litig.*, Case No. 736748-7 (Cal. Super.

Ct., Alameda County) (obtained extensive corporate governance enhancements).

Mr. Downs is a member of the Bar of the State of California and is also admitted to practice before the district courts of the Central, Northern and Southern Districts of California. He is also a member of the American Bar Association and the San Diego County Bar Association. Mr. Downs lectures and participates in professional education programs.

G. PAUL HOWES, after Marine Corps Vietnam service, received his Bachelor of Arts degree with distinction from the University of New Mexico, was elected to Phi Beta Kappa and Phi Kappa Phi, and was the tympanist for the New Mexico Symphony Orchestra. He received his Juris Doctor degree and Masters in Public Administration from the University of Virginia. He served as a Special Assistant to the Director of the FBI, Judge William H. Webster, and then as a law clerk to Judge Roger Robb, United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. He was an ABC News correspondent for the Washington Bureau and then served for 11 years as an Assistant U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, primarily prosecuting complex drug organization homicides. He is a member of the New Mexico, District of Columbia and California Bars.

SPENCER A. BURKHOLZ received his Bachelor of Arts degree in Economics, *cum laude*, from Clark University in 1985, where he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa, and received his Juris Doctor degree from University of Virginia School of Law in 1989. Mr. Burkholz concentrates his practice in securities class actions, and has recovered settlements in the following cases: *3Com* (\$259 million); *Vesta Ins.* (\$78 million); *Samsonite* (\$24 million); *Emulex* (\$39 million); *Mossimo* (\$13 million); *Triteal* (\$13.8 million); *Price Co.* (\$15 million); *Stratosphere Corp.* (\$9 million); and *IMP* (\$9.5 million).

Mr. Burkholz was also on the trial team in *Long v. Wells Fargo*. Mr. Burkholz is currently representing large public and multi-employer pension funds seeking to recover for their investments in WorldCom bonds. Mr. Burkholz is a member of the California Bar and has been admitted to practice in numerous federal courts throughout the country.

TIMOTHY G. BLOOD graduated *cum laude* and with honors in Economics from Hobart College in 1987 and the National Law Center of George Washington University in 1990. He was elected to Phi Beta Kappa, Omicron Delta Epsilon (Economics) and the Moot Court Board (first year honors).

Mr. Blood focuses on consumer fraud and unfair competition litigation with a focus on actions brought by policyholders against life and property and casualty insurers for deceptive sales practices, racial discrimination and systematic failures in claims adjustment. Mr. Blood has been involved in a number of cases that have resulted in significant settlements, including *McNeil v. Am. Gen. Life & Accident Ins. Co.* (\$234 million), *Lee v. USLife Corp.* (\$148 million), *Garst v. Franklin Life Ins. Co.* (\$90.1 million), *In re Gen. Am. Sales Practices Litig.* (\$67 million), *Williams v. United Ins. Co. of Am.* (\$51.4 million); and *Sternberg v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (\$50 million).

Mr. Blood is also responsible for several precedent-setting appellate decisions, including *Lebrilla v. Farmers Group, Inc.*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1070 (2004). Mr. Blood is a frequent lecturer on class action procedure and consumer fraud issues and is a member of the Board of Governors of the Consumer Attorneys of California.

Mr. Blood is admitted to practice in California and in the U.S. Courts of Appeals for the Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, Ninth and Eleventh Circuits and the U.S. District Courts for the Southern, Central, Eastern and Northern Districts of California. He is a member of the San Diego

County and American Bar Associations, the State Bar of California, the Association of Business Trial Lawyers, the Association of Trial Lawyers of America and the Consumer Attorneys of California.

ARTHUR C. LEAHY graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Business from Point Loma College in 1987. In 1990, Mr. Leahy graduated *cum laude* and received a Juris Doctor degree from the University of San Diego School of Law, where he served as Managing Editor of the Law Review. While in law school, Mr. Leahy authored an article published in the *San Diego Law Review* and other articles published in another law journal. In addition, he served as a judicial extern for the Honorable J. Clifford Wallace of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. After law school, Mr. Leahy served as a judicial law clerk for the Honorable Alan C. Kay of the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii.

For eight years, Mr. Leahy has worked on securities fraud and consumer class actions in which his clients recovered millions of dollars. Mr. Leahy is a member of the California Bar and has been admitted in numerous federal courts throughout the country.

FRANK J. JANECEK, JR. received his Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology from the University of California at Davis in 1987, and his Juris Doctor degree from Loyola Law School in 1991. He is admitted to the Bar of the State of California, the district courts for all districts California, and to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth, Ninth and Eleventh Circuits. For 11 years, Mr. Janeczek has practiced in the area of consumer, Proposition 65, taxpayer and tobacco litigation. He has participated as a panelist and a speaker in continuing legal education programs relating to California's Unfair Competition laws, public enforcement tobacco litigation and challenging unconstitutional taxation schemes.

Mr. Janecek litigated several Proposition 65 actions, including *People ex. rel. Lungren v. Superior Court*, 14 Cal. 4th 294 (1996), which was jointly prosecuted with the Attorney General's office. These actions resulted in the recovery of more than \$10 million in disgorgement and/or civil penalties and warnings to consumers of their exposure to cancer-causing agents and reproductive toxins. Mr. Janecek chaired several of the litigation committees in California's tobacco litigation, which resulted in the \$25.5 billion recovery for California and its local entities. Mr. Janecek also handled a constitutional challenge to the State of California's Smog Impact Fee, in the case *Ramos v. Dep't of Motor Vehicles*, Case No. 95AS00532 (Sacramento Super. Ct.). As a result of the *Ramos* litigation, more than a million California residents received full refunds, plus interest, totaling \$665 million.

Mr. Janecek is the co-author with Patrick J. Coughlin of "A Review of R.J. Reynolds' Internal Documents Produced in *Mangini v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.*, No. 939359 - The Case that Rid California and the American Landscape of 'Joe Camel'" (January 1998), which, along with more than 60,000 internal industry documents, was released to the public through Congressman Henry Waxman. He is also the author of *California's Unfair Competition Act and Its Role in the Tobacco Wars* (Fall 1997). Mr. Janecek is a member of the American Bar Association, the California Bar Association, the San Diego County Bar Association and the Consumer Attorneys of California and San Diego.

DAVID J. GEORGE earned his Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science from the University of Rhode Island, *summa cum laude*. Mr. George then graduated at the top of his class at the University of Richmond School of Law. At the University of Richmond, Mr. George was a member of *Law Review*, was the President of the McNeill Law Society/Order of the Coif, and earned numerous academic awards, including outstanding academic performance in each of

his three years there and outstanding graduate.

Before joining Lerach Coughlin, he was a partner in the Boca Raton office of Geller Rudman, PLLC. While at Geller Rudman, Mr. George, a zealous advocate of shareholder rights, has been lead and/or co-lead counsel with respect to various securities class action matters, including *In re Cryo Cell Int'l, Inc. Sec. Litig.* (M.D. Fla.), *In re Gilead Scis. Sec. Litig.* (N.D. Cal.) and *Mobility Electronics Sec. Litig.* (D. Ariz.). Mr. George has also acted as lead counsel in numerous consumer class actions. Before joining Geller Rudman, Mr. George spent more than a decade as a commercial litigator with two of the largest corporate law firms in the United States. During that time, Mr. George aggressively prosecuted and defended a wide array of complex commercial litigation matters, including securities class action matters, non-compete litigation, fraud claims, and real estate-based litigation matters.

Mr. George is licensed to practice law in the state courts of Florida, as well as the United States District Courts for the Southern, Middle and Northern Districts of Florida. He is currently or has been a member of the American Bar Association, the Academy of Florida Trial Lawyers, the Palm Beach County Bar Association and the South Palm Beach County Bar Association.

SANFORD SVETCOV is a partner with the Appellate Practice Group of Lerach Coughlin. He has briefed and argued more than 300 appeals in state and federal court, including: *Braxton v. Mun. Court*, 10 Cal. 3d 138 (1973) (First Amendment); *Procurier v. Navarette*, 434 U.S. 555 (1978) (civil rights); *Parker Plaza West Partners v. UNUM Pension & Ins. Co.*, 941 F.2d 349 (5th Cir. 1991) (real estate); *Catellus Dev. Corp. v. United States*, 34 F.3d 748 (9th Cir. 1994) (CERCLA); *United States v. Hove*, 52 F.3d 233 (9th Cir. 1995) (criminal law); *Kelly v. City of Oakland*, 198 F.3d 779 (9th Cir. 1999) (employment law, same gender sexual

harassment); *United States v. Henke*, 222 F.3d 633 (9th Cir. 2000) (securities fraud); *Moore v. Liberty Nat'l Life Ins. Co.*, 267 F.3d 1209 (11th Cir. 2001) (civil rights); and *In re Cavanaugh*, 306 F.3d 726 (9th Cir. 2002) (securities fraud).

Mr. Svetcov's professional appellate litigation experience includes securities fraud litigation, CERCLA, CEQA, commercial litigation, Clean Water Act, Civil Rights Act litigation, toxic torts, federal criminal law, California writ practice, employment law and ERISA.

Mr. Svetcov was a partner with the firm of Landels Ripley & Diamond, LLP, in San Francisco, from 1989 to 2000. His extensive legal experience includes service as: Chief, Appellate Section, U.S. Attorney's Office, San Francisco, 1984-1989; Attorney-in-Charge, Organized Crime Strike Force, San Francisco, 1981-1984; Chief Assistant U.S. Attorney, San Francisco, 1978-1981; Deputy Attorney General, State of California, 1969-1977; Legal Officer, U.S. Navy, VT-25, Chase Field, Beeville, Texas, 1966-1969; and Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legislature of California, Sacramento, 1965-1966.

Mr. Svetcov is certified as a Specialist in Appellate Practice by the State Bar of California Board of Legal Specialization. He was selected by the Attorney General for the Department of Justice's John Marshall Award for Excellence in Appellate Advocacy in 1986 and is a member and past President (1998) of the American Academy of Appellate Lawyers, and a member of the California Academy of Appellate Lawyers.

In 1999, Chief Justice Rehnquist appointed Mr. Svetcov to a three-year term on the Federal Appellate Rules Advisory Committee. He is also an ex-officio member of the Ninth Circuit Rules Advisory Committee on Rules and Internal Operating Procedures. His other memberships and service commitments to the legal profession include: the California Academy of Appellate Lawyers; the Bar

Association of San Francisco (Appellate Courts section); the American Bar Association (Appellate Judges Conference) Committee on Appellate Practice; and the Northern California Federal Bar Association, Board of Directors.

Mr. Svetcov earned his Bachelor of Arts degree, *cum laude*, from Brooklyn College in 1961 and his Juris Doctor degree from the University of California at Berkeley in 1964. He is a member of the Bars of the State of California, the U.S. Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals, Fifth, Eighth, Ninth and Eleventh Circuits, and the U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

For two decades, he has been active as a teacher and lecturer at continuing legal education programs, including those of the ABA Appellate Practice Institutes (1990-2000); the Ninth Circuit Federal Bar Association Appellate Practice Seminar, and the N.I.T.A. Appellate Advocacy Seminar and Fifth Circuit Bar Association Appellate Practice Seminars (1991-1999). He has served as an adjunct professor at Hastings College of Law and an instructor in Appellate Advocacy at the U.S. Attorney General's Advocacy Institute (1980-1989).

Mr. Svetcov is also active in community affairs. He has been a member of the San Francisco Jewish Community Relations Council since 1982, its president from 1991-1992, and during the years 1993-1995, he also served on the Northern California Hillel Council.

MICHAEL J. DOWD graduated from Fordham University, *magna cum laude*, with a Bachelor of Arts degree in History and Latin in 1981. While at Fordham, he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. He earned his Juris Doctor degree from the University of Michigan School of Law in 1981 and entered private practice in New York that same year. He was admitted to practice in New York in 1985 and in California in 1988.

Mr. Dowd served as an Assistant U.S. Attorney in the Southern District of California from 1987-1991 and again from 1994-1998. As an Assistant U.S. Attorney, Mr. Dowd obtained extensive trial experience, including the prosecution of bank fraud, bribery, money laundering and narcotics cases. He is a recipient of the Director's Award for Superior Performance as an Assistant U.S. Attorney. Mr. Dowd has been responsible for prosecuting complex securities cases and obtaining recoveries for investors, including cases involving *Safeskin* (\$55 million recovery), *Bergen Brunswig* (\$42.5 million recovery), and *P-Com* (\$16 million recovery). Mr. Dowd was the lead lawyer for the Lerach Coughlin trial team in *In re AT&T Corp. Sec. Litig.*, which was tried in the District of New Jersey and settled after two weeks of trial for \$100 million. Mr. Dowd is currently one of the lead litigators in the firm's *WorldCom* litigation, representing over 70 public and multi-employer pension funds and other financial institutions. Mr. Dowd has also participated in the firm's tobacco and firearms cases.

DAVID C. WALTON earned his Bachelor of Arts degree in Accounting from the University of Utah and his Juris Doctor degree from the University of Southern California Law Center in 1993. While there, he was a staff member of the *Southern California Law Review* and a member of the Hale Moot Court Honors Program.

Mr. Walton is a member of the Bar of California. Mr. Walton, a Certified Public Accountant (California, 1992) and Certified Fraud Examiner, who is also fluent in Spanish, focuses on class actions on behalf of defrauded investors, particularly in the area of accounting fraud. He has investigated and participated in the litigation of many large accounting scandals, including Enron, WorldCom, Informix, HealthSouth, Dynegy and Dollar General. In 2003-2004, Mr. Walton served as a member of the California Board of Accountancy which is responsible for

regulating the accounting profession in California.

RANDALL H. STEINMEYER earned his Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Southern California in 1993, and his Juris Doctor degree, *cum laude*, from Hamline University School of Law in 1996, where he was a member of the *Hamline Law Review*. He is the author of *The Interrelationship Between NASD Arbitrations and NASD Disciplinary Proceedings*, 281 Practising Law Institute (1998). Formerly, Mr. Steinmeyer headed the securities litigation department of Reinhardt & Anderson in St. Paul, Minnesota. Mr. Steinmeyer is a member of the Bar of Minnesota and the U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota. Mr. Steinmeyer is a former securities broker and held a Series 7 license with the National Association of Securities Dealers.

In 2003, he was a guest lecturer at Oxford University on the impact of corporate and broker dealer fraud on the investment community. He also sits on the Board of Directors of the Hedge Fund Association. He has authored numerous articles on the hedge fund industry and offshore financial community.

Mr. Steinmeyer focuses on class actions on behalf of defrauded investors. Mr. Steinmeyer was appointed lead counsel in several large and complex class actions which resulted in the recovery of tens of millions of dollars for aggrieved investors. Mr. Steinmeyer's reported cases include: *Ganesh LLC v. Computer Learning Ctrs.*, 1998 WL 892622 (E.D. Va. 1998); *Gart v. Electroscope*, 1998 WL 757970 (D. Minn. 1998); *Chill v. Green Tree Fin. Corp.*, 181 F.R.D. 398 (D. Minn. 1998); and *In re Transcrypt Int'l Sec. Litig.*, Case No. 4:98CV3099, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17540 (D. Neb. Nov. 4, 1999).

JEFFREY W. LAWRENCE received his Bachelor of Arts degree, *magna cum laude*, from Tufts University in 1976. In 1979, Mr. Lawrence graduated *magna cum laude* with a Juris